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Integrity tests are among the least utilized pre-employment selection instruments due, at least in part, to concern regarding the ease at which applicants can successfully fake their responses. The current study attempted to assess the extent to which actual job applicants fake overt integrity tests. We assigned one group of applicants to an honest condition and one group to a standard response condition. Applicants in the honest condition received a set of instructions that were modified to illustrate the importance of responding as honestly as possible when completing the questionnaire, whereas the standard response condition received a set of instructions that were not modified. We hypothesized that job applicants in the honest group would score worse on the integrity test and social desirability scales than would applicants completing the tests under the normal instructions. We failed to find a significant difference between groups on the scores on the integrity test but did find a significant difference between the groups on the social desirability scale.
Job Applicant Faking of Overt Integrity Tests: Fact or Fantasy?

Integrity tests are utilized as assessment instruments for the pre-employment process in many organizations. Recently there has been rapid growth in the use of integrity tests by businesses (Camara & Schneider, 1994; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993). As the use of integrity tests increases, concerns regarding their use has increased as well. Although many employers are aware of the potential benefits of integrity testing, concern continues to grow about the applicability of the tests. Many test users are apprehensive about the faking problem that is associated with integrity tests. Researchers have conducted studies to address this issue; however, there continues to be a dearth of information regarding integrity testing and the faking problem.

Legal Issues and Integrity Tests

The 1988 Employee Polygraph Protection Act banned the use of pre-employment polygraph examinations by private employers (Sackett, Burris, & Callahan, 1989). Integrity tests were designed to be a replacement for polygraph exams. Integrity tests are less costly, less time consuming, and less invasive than the polygraph examinations (Budman, 1993). Currently, test publishers attempt to distance themselves from the polygraph (Sackett et al., 1989). The Massachusetts Polygraph Act was revised to state as follows.

As used in this section the term “lie detector” shall mean any test using a polygraph or any other device, mechanism, instrument, or written examination, which is operated, or the results of which are used or interpreted by an examiner for the purpose of purporting to assist in or enable the detection of deception, the
verification of truthfulness, or the rendering of a diagnostic opinion regarding the honesty of an individual (Sackett et al., p. 497).

This occurrence may depict a trend regarding integrity tests. The State of Rhode Island also revised its definition of the lie detector, allowing that written examinations (integrity tests) may be used as long as they are not the main basis for employment assessment (Sackett et al., 1989). Similar bills have been established in other states with assistance from labor unions. Thus, the legal status of integrity testing is currently in question and subject to change.

Reports on Integrity Tests

The popularity of integrity testing in the pre-employment selection process has increased over time (Ryan & Sackett, 1987). Although use of integrity tests had grown, the research concerning integrity testing had not (Camara, & Schneider, 1994). The lack of research on integrity tests was a significant concern for many tests users, in addition to governmental and American Psychological Association (APA) concerns.

The United States Congress Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) conducted a study of integrity testing, which included psychologists in consultative roles (Camara & Schneider, 1994). The object of the OTA was to guide Congress in determining if legislative action on integrity tests was necessary. The OTA report stressed that integrity tests should be held to high standards because they label individuals as being dishonest (Sackett, 1994). According to the OTA report, if integrity tests were to have increased use in organizations, many more individuals could be wrongly labeled as dishonest, which would in turn have damaging effects. The APA’s report, produced by
psychologists with a target audience of psychologists and test users, was more positive regarding the use of integrity tests (Ones et al., 1993).

Although the OTA report does not consider the issue of alternatives to integrity tests, the APA report states that banning integrity tests will only cause employers to seek other means of determining which employees will commit crimes of theft (Sackett & Wanek, 1996). The APA report indicated that if employers believe that there is a theft problem, they will find the means to address it. According to Sackett and Wanek (1996), the outlawing of polygraph testing actually led to the interest in integrity testing. Consequently, if integrity tests are banned, employers will continue to search for an alternative to detect those individuals that may commit illegal acts while on the job.

*Integrity Tests and Their Use*

Camara and Schneider (1994) conducted research that documented the use of integrity tests. Their survey of integrity test publishers indicated that only 5% require that the test user have a graduate degree or other specialized license. Fifty-six percent of the publishers indicated that they have no formal means of screening test users, while 64% do screen test users but do not use test user qualification forms to do so. The majority of integrity tests are scored by test publishers who use computer software programs. Cutoff scores are provided to the test users for virtually all of the overt integrity tests. Camara and Schneider (1994) indicated that cutoff scores might be general or specific, depending on the test publisher. Narrative reports, which are computer generated, are also available for the majority of integrity tests.

One way test publishers classify psychological tests is either as proprietary or nonproprietary. The majority of integrity tests are categorized as proprietary. When test
users purchase a proprietary test from a publisher, they receive ongoing support (Camara & Schneider, 1994). The test publisher will continue to have responsibility for the integrity test as regards norming, scoring, validating, and interpreting. The test publisher will also provide continuous support regarding psychological proficiency. The test users are responsible for administering the test, safeguarding the results of the test scores, and making the decisions that will be made based on the test scores. In contrast, test publishers will sell their integrity test to test users based on the users’ qualifications to administer and interpret the test in a nonproprietary test system (Camara & Schneider, 1994).

The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing state that the responsibility for the utilization of the test lies with the test user (Camara & Schneider, 1994). If steps are taken to ensure that test users are competent, the risk of misuse may be reduced.

*Types of Integrity Tests*

Ones, Viswesvaran, and Schmidt (1993) conducted a meta analysis that examined the average validity and generalizability of the validity of integrity tests. They stated that integrity tests could be separated into two measures of interest: overall job performance and counter productivity. The approximate mean true validity ($\rho$) of both overt integrity tests and personality based measures with the measures of overall job performance was .34. Integrity test validities were positive across situations for the measures of overall job performance, which is indicated by the 90% credibility value of .20. Based on the analysis, it was concluded that integrity tests have an estimated mean operational validity of .41 (Ones et al., 1993). Their research indicates that integrity tests are valuable for
making useful predictions of job performance and counterproductive behaviors (e.g., employee theft).

Previous research has classified integrity tests into two groups: overt integrity tests and personality oriented tests. Overt integrity tests ask questions concerning attitudes towards theft and inquire about dishonest and illegal incidents that have previously occurred (Sackett et al., 1989). Overt integrity tests consist of two sections. One of the sections pertains to attitudes concerning theft and different forms of dishonesty; whereas, the other section deals with an individual’s confession of theft. Attitudes of previous illegal activities are designed to predict the behavior of the job applicant (Cunningham, Wong, & Barbee, 1994). Types of overt integrity tests include the London House Personnel Selection Inventory, the Reid Report, and the Stanton Survey.

Personality oriented integrity tests inquire about behaviors concerning dependability, conscientiousness, social conformity, trouble with authority, and hostility (Sackett & Wanek, 1996). Personality based measures presume that an individual’s personality traits will indicate whether the individual is a thief (Sackett et al., 1989). Personality based measures include the Personal Outlook Inventory, the Personnel Reaction Blank, the PDI Employment Inventory, the Reliability Scale of the Hogan Personnel Selection Series, and the London House Employment Productivity Index. Research has indicated that overt integrity tests are somewhat better than personality based measures for the prediction of on the job theft (Cunningham et al., 1994). Finally, research indicates that overt integrity tests do not result in adverse impact for race or gender (Sackett, 1994; Sackett et al., 1989).
The Faking Problem

Due to the number of bankruptcies in businesses that have been attributed to employee theft (Brown, Jones, Terris, & Steffy, 1987), it is imperative to detect those individuals that may have the potential to participate in theft once they are placed on the job (Cunningham et al., 1994). The implementation of integrity tests in the pre-employment selection process is one way to combat this problem.

Although there are many potential benefits to using integrity tests, concerns remain about their use in practice. Integrity tests’ vulnerability to faking produces a large amount of uncertainty regarding their validity (Ones et al., 1993). In spite of the general concern surrounding integrity tests, there is a lack of research conducted on integrity tests and the faking problem. However, there have been extensive amounts of test faking research conducted on personality tests.

Personality Test Faking

There has been an extensive amount of research that indicates that individuals manipulate their test scores on personality tests (Zickar & Drasgow, 1996). Social desirability scales and lying scales have been used in conjunction with personality tests in an attempt to identify individuals who may fake their answers on a personality test (Zickar & Drasgow, 1996). Previous research has revealed that individuals can successfully inflate their tests scores on personality tests (Rosse, Stecher, Miller, & Levin, 1998). Rosse et al. (1998) indicated that faking on personality tests did occur with actual job applicants. There was a decreased occurrence of faking among job incumbents as opposed to the job applicants, a group with a greater motivation to distort their scores.
The researchers concluded that faking should be examined when employers use personality tests for pre-employment selection (Rosse et al., 1998).

Research has suggested that responding in a socially desirable manner consists of two components: self deception and impression management (McFarland & Ryan, 2000). Self deception is an individual’s tendency to unconsciously see him or herself in a more favorable way, whereas impression management is an individual’s conscious attempt to be viewed more favorably by faking. Research indicates that self deception should not be a concern to test users that are utilizing personality tests or integrity tests (McFarland & Ryan, 2000).

McFarland and Ryan (2000) examined the faking problem associated with both personality tests and integrity tests. The results indicated that individuals with low scores in integrity, low scores in conscientiousness, and high scores in neuroticism measures had a tendency to fake on personality and integrity tests. Although all noncognitive measures in their study were easily faked, integrity tests were the most fakable measure.

*Integrity Testing and The Faking Problem*

To examine the effectiveness of integrity testing, Brown et al. (1987) conducted a study that evaluated the Personnel Selection Inventory (PSI). They examined the PSI’s effectiveness in decreasing turnover due to employee theft, violence, and narcotics over a five-year period. Several changes occurred when the PSI was introduced into the organization as part of the pre-employment selection process. First, employee terminations caused by on-the-job theft were decreased by 50%. Second, employee terminations that were caused by drug usage that occurred while the employee was on the job was greatly reduced. Third, there was a dramatic reduction in the seasonal effect of
employee terminations. The fourth and final occurrence was a reduction in theft of over two million dollars over a two-year period.

As indicated in Brown et al. (1987), there are many potential benefits associated with the use of integrity tests, but employers are hesitant to use them because of their susceptibility to faking. Alliger and Dwight (2000) conducted a review that evaluated the vulnerability of overt integrity tests and personality based measures to faking and coaching. When given the fake good instructions, respondents were able to increase their scores on an overt integrity test by one standard deviation and one half standard deviation on personality based tests. Although the results indicated that personality based measures may be less susceptible to faking than over integrity tests, overt integrity tests have been found to be better at predicting on the job theft.

Ryan and Sackett (1987) conducted a study that addressed the faking problem by examining the effects of different instructions placed on integrity tests. Individuals were instructed to answer honestly, fake good, or respond as if they were job applicants. The integrity test consisted of a theft attitude scale, a social desirability scale, and a theft history scale. The results indicate that the theft attitude scale can be distorted quite easily. Participants responding in the role of a job applicant responded in a way that was more closely related to the honest group, as opposed to the fake good group. In the conditions in which participants responded honestly and in which they attempted to fake, the social desirability scale was marginally effective at detecting faking.

Lobello and Sims (1993) conducted a study designed to test whether convicted felons were capable of providing favorable profiles on an integrity test. The inmates were randomly assigned to three groups. The first group was told to respond in a way that
would make a favorable impression to the employer. The second group was instructed to respond as truthfully as possible and was asked to resist the urge to create a favorable impression. The third group was not given a particular set of instructions. The test that they used provided scores on a number of scales including Trustworthiness, Alienation, Drinking and Drugs, Evasiveness, and a total score. They found significant differences among the three groups on the Trustworthiness and Alienation scales as well as the total scores with the more favorable scores for the fake good group. Consequently, more participants that were in the group instructed to fake good would have been offered jobs.

In an experiment designed to assess the construct validity of the Reid Report, Cunningham et al. (1994) overpaid test takers for their participation in research a study. The honesty assessment was whether the participants returned the extra money. Seventy-eight percent of the participants returned the extra money. Reid Report scores were significantly related to whether the participants returned the money, $r = .33$.

**Summary of Relevant Research**

Although integrity test use is growing (Budman, 1993), it is one of the least utilized tools of selection in the pre-employment assessment process. Tests of mechanical aptitude, industrial skills, knowledge, and personality are used in employee selection at a much higher rate than are integrity tests. In a survey of managers conducted by Harris, Dworkin, and Park (1990), honesty tests were ranked 13th (out of 14) in terms of popularity as predictors of job performance.

**The Present Study**

A review of the literature concerning integrity testing and the faking problem indicates the need for further research. With the exception of Lobello and Sims (1993),
which used prison inmates, previous studies have used only participants in the college setting. Although Cunningham et al. (1994) attempted to use only employees in their study, they also had to elicit the use of college students as participants. Given that the majority of integrity tests are utilized in organizations during the selection process for low paying jobs (Sackett, 1994), existing research regarding the magnitude of integrity test faking is lacking.

There have been no studies found that have attempted to study integrity tests and the faking problem in an organizational setting with actual job applicants as participants. In addition, the majority of the studies concerning the faking problem have instructed participants to either fake good, to be as honest as possible, or have given no particular change in instructions (Alliger & Dwight, 2000; Cunningham et al., 1994; Lobello & Sims, 1993; Ryan & Sackett, 1987). Finally, no studies have compared the responses of participants instructed to answer as honestly as possible against responses from those who have received a set of instructions that have not been modified. The present study will employ actual job applicants in an organizational setting and will examine the magnitude of faking among these job applicants.

Hypothesis 1: Job applicants given instructions to answer as honestly as possible will have lower integrity test scores (i.e., display lower levels of integrity) than will job applicants receiving standard administration instructions.

Integrity tests and social desirability tests have consistently been found to correlate with one another (Cunningham et al., 1994; Sackett et al., 1989). We will administer a social desirability scale to the job applicants in conjunction with the integrity test.
Hypothesis 2: Job applicants given instructions to answer as honestly as possible will have lower social desirability scale scores (i.e., display less socially desirable answering) than will job applicants receiving standard administration instructions.
Method

Participants

A total of 98 participants were obtained for the current study. The participants were separated into two conditions: an honest condition and a standard response condition. Forty-five participants were in the honest condition, whereas 53 participants were in the standard response condition. An additional eight applicants in the honest condition declined to participate in the experiment. All respondents in the standard response condition agreed to participate. The participants consisted of job applicants at an organization located in the middle Tennessee region. The organization is a nonprofit business that has offices located in 26 counties.

Instruments

The instrument used to measure the participants’ integrity was the Reid Report. The Reid Report is a 51-item paper and pencil questionnaire designed to measure an individual’s attitudes and past behaviors associated with integrity (Reid, 1992).

The instrument used to measure social desirability was the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale is a 33-item questionnaire which is also available in a 10-item short form. The short form of the Marlowe-Crowne was used in the present study. The short form correlates highly ($r > .8$) with the original 33-item questionnaire (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). The Reid Report and the Marlowe-Crowne were seamlessly combined into one test for the benefit of the job applicant.
Procedure

Job applicants were randomly assigned to either the honest group or the standard response group. Data collected from the honest group were collected anonymously (to encourage complete candor). Data from the standard response group remains confidential. Before receiving the combined Reid Report and the Marlowe-Crowne, applicants in the honest condition were asked to review an informed consent document (Appendix A). Applicants in the standard response condition received a slightly modified informed consent document after completing the job application materials and the two tests (Appendix B). The instructions given to the applicants are listed in Appendix C. Applicants in the honest group received a set of instructions that were modified to illustrate the importance of responding as honestly as possible when completing the questionnaire. Applicants in the standard response group received a set of instructions that were not modified from those given in the test manual. After participants completed the questionnaire, they received a debriefing statement (listed in Appendix D) indicating that their responses to the questionnaire were part of a research study and would not affect their chances of being hired.
Results

The correlation between scores on the Reid Report integrity test and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale was positive and significant, indicating that people reporting high levels of integrity also responded in a socially desirable manner, \( r = .32, p < .05 \). Descriptive statistics for all variables are listed in Table 1.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the job applicants in the honest condition would have lower scores on the Reid Report than would applicants answering in the standard response condition. The mean difference between scores from the two conditions was 1.8 points (Cohen’s d = .29) in the hypothesized direction. An independent samples t test indicated that there was no difference between Reid Report scores from the two conditions, \( t(96) = 1.44, p > .05 \).

Hypothesis 2 stated that the job applicants in the honest condition would have lower scores on the Marlowe-Crowne than would applicants in the standard response condition. The mean score difference was 1.0 points (Cohen’s d = .64). An independent samples t test indicated the difference between groups on the Marlowe-Crowne was significant, \( t(96) = 3.06, p < .05 \).

In a follow up analysis Reid Report responses were analyzed according to item type. Previously, Brown and Cothern (2002) analyzed Reid Report data at the overall level as well as for past behavioral and hypothetical subsets of questions. Their results indicated differential faking success based on item type. Faking was less successful and more highly correlated with intelligence for the hypothetical items than for the behavioral items.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reid Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest Response</td>
<td>36.22</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Response</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Behavioral Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest Response</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Response</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest Response</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Response</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marlowe-Crowne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest Response</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Response</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Total sample size equals 98. Sample sizes for the honest and standard response conditions equal 45 and 53, respectively.
An examination of Reid Report scores separately by item type in the present study revealed no differences between groups (Cohen’s $d = .13$) for the past behavioral questions, $t(96) = .60, p > .05$. There was, however, a significant difference between groups (Cohen’s $d = .39$) for the hypothetical questions, $t(96) = 1.86, p < .05$. 
Discussion

The purpose of the current study is to assess the extent to which job applicants fake their answers to integrity tests. We randomly assigned actual job applicants to one of two response conditions: standard responding consistent with the manner in which all job applicants complete application materials and honest responding. We hypothesized that job applicants instructed to answer honestly would score lower on an integrity test (lower levels of integrity) and a social desirability scale (less socially desirable answering) than would applicants completing the tests under the normal instructions. We failed to find a significant difference between groups on the scores on the integrity test but did find a significant difference between the groups on the social desirability scale. The discrepancy between the results of the two analyses may be related to the less transparent nature of the Marlowe-Crowne’s items which are not as behaviorally specific as many of the items on the Reid Report.

Previous research has analyzed Reid Report data at the total score level as well as by item type: past behavioral versus hypothetical questions (Brown & Cothern, 2002). As a supplemental analysis, we also analyzed the data by item type. Results for the past behavioral items revealed no significant differences between the groups. However, there was a significant difference between groups for the hypothetical questions, with higher scores (greater levels of integrity) observed in the standard response condition. Thus, applicants appear to be faking hypothetical integrity test questions, social desirability questions (which are not highly personal and behaviorally specific), but not past behavioral integrity test questions. There are three possible explanations for these results.

First, assuming the participants in the honest condition answered honestly, it is
possible that the applicants in the standard response condition decided not to fake the past behavioral items. Second, again assuming that the participants in the honest condition answered honestly, the case may be that applicants in the standard response condition attempted to fake all of the items but were unsuccessful in faking the past behavioral questions. Third, assuming the standard response condition participants decided to fake and were successful at faking both item types, applicants in the honest condition may have decided to fake their answers to the past behavioral items but not the other questions; that is, applicants in the honest group did not answer honestly for both item types. Given previous research (Brown & Cothern, 2002) indicating the ease of faking the past behavioral items, as well as common sense (why deny impersonal negative attitudes while admitting negative behaviors), the first two reasons are unlikely. Thus, the results suggest that individuals may be more willing to be honest on hypothetical items and to endorse undesirable responses to questions that are not as personal and behaviorally specific. As such, it may be premature to conclude that job applicants do not fake integrity tests. Although we failed to find overall integrity test score differences, faking may be occurring among actual job applicants but is masked by faking among the honest group.

Limitations, Future Directions, and Conclusion

As with almost all research, the current study suffers from a number of limitations. The scoring key for the Reid Report had to be constructed by the researchers, due to the fact that the Reid Report is a proprietary test with protected scoring procedures. Any lack of correspondence between our scoring key and the real scoring key would undermine the findings of the current study.
Another limitation with the current study is that we were unable to collect demographic data. Demographic information could not be obtained because the data were collected during the application process, and the host organization does not collect any information that identifies the applicant’s gender, race, or age as part of the application process. The lack of availability of demographic data limits the generalizability of the findings of the study. Future studies may find it beneficial to attempt to obtain participants that are from different industries or include skilled laborers or upper management. Finally, the results suggest that members of the honest group may not have been completely honest when responding to the past behavioral questions. If that is the case, then any conclusion stating that actual job applicants do not fake integrity tests would be incorrect. Future research should further explore the extent to which actual job applicants fake their responses on integrity tests and should incorporate alternative ways to increase candor in the honest response conditions.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Document for Honest Condition

Project Title: Overt Integrity Testing: Is There a Faking Problem?

Investigator: Caitlin Stewart, Graduate Student, 745-3280
Dr. Reagan Brown, Department of Psychology, 745-6939

You are being asked to participate in a thesis project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project. It is also required that you be 18 years or older to complete the research project and that you have no physical or mental disabilities.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. Your may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any question you may have.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the bottom of this page in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

Explanation:

For this project you will complete a 61-item questionnaire. Many of these items will ask you questions about your previous behavior on jobs. The questionnaire will be used strictly for research purposes and in no way will be used to make hiring decisions. No employee of Goodwill Industries will see any completed questionnaires.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that my anonymity is guaranteed and that I am free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time. I understand that the study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Western Kentucky University.

If you discover that you are uncomfortable with any part of the study, you are free to discontinue and shred the questionnaire.

After (date provided), you are invited to contact Dr. Brown or Caitlin Stewart to obtain the results of the study. However, because of your privacy and anonymity, we will not be able to give you information concerning your personal results.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

I have read the explanation above and agree to participate in this study.

Signature ______________________ Date ________________

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
Dr. Phillip E. Myers, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-4652
Appendix B

Informed Consent Document for Standard Response Condition

Project Title: Overt Integrity Testing: Is There a Faking Problem?

Investigator: Caitlin Stewart, Graduate Student, 745-3280
Dr. Reagan Brown, Department of Psychology, 745-6939

Thank you for participating in the research study. The questionnaire that you completed is going to be examined to find out if it actually works as an integrity test. Your data will remain completely anonymous and in no way will be used for hiring purposes. If you want to know more about the study or want to know the outcome once the study is finished please feel free to contact Dr. Brown or Caitlin Stewart (phone numbers can be found above). However, we will not be able to give out individual information since the data is anonymous.

You are being asked to allow the questionnaire that you completed, to be used for a thesis project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project. It is also required that you be 18 years or older to participate in the research project and that you have no physical or mental disabilities.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures that were used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. Your may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any question you may have.

If you then decide to allow the investigator to keep your questionnaire, please sign at the bottom of this page in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

Explanation:

For this project you completed a 61-item questionnaire. Many of these items asked you questions about your previous behavior on jobs. The questionnaire will be used strictly for research purposes and in no way will be used to make hiring decisions. No employee of Goodwill Industries will see any completed questionnaires.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that my anonymity is guaranteed and that I am free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time. I understand that the study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Western Kentucky University.

If you discover that you are uncomfortable with any part of the study, you are free to discontinue and shred the questionnaire.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

I have read the explanation above and agree to participate in this study.

Signature Date

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
Dr. Phillip E. Myers, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-4652
Appendix C

Script for Procedure

Before you begin:
Job applicants will complete the Reid Report in one of the two conditions, honest or standard response. We will simply alternate between conditions. That is, one person will complete the Reid Report under the honest condition and the next person will complete it under the standard response condition. The Reid Report for each condition is the same except the standard response condition has a cover sheet attached to it. When a job applicant walks in to fill out an application, take the Reid Report on top of the stack. If the first page of the Reid Report is a cover sheet with space for a name, then it’s for people in the standard response group. If there is no cover sheet, then it’s the honest group.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE "STANDARD RESPONSE" GROUP:
1. Hand the job applicant an application and the Reid Report.

SAY:
Please complete the application packet and return it to me when you are finished.

2. Once the Reid Report is completed and turned in, give the participants the informed consent document.

SAY:
The questionnaire that you completed was part of a research study conducted by a graduate student at Western Kentucky University. The questionnaire will be used strictly for research purposes and in no way will be used to make hiring decisions. The information obtained from the questionnaire will be completely anonymous. Please tear off the cover sheet and keep it to ensure your anonymity. Now we don’t know your name. Here is an informed consent document, please read the consent form.

3. If do not allow us to use data: Please tear up the questionnaire.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE “HONEST” GROUP:
1. Give the job applicants their application.
2. Collect their completed application.
3. Indicate that the application process is now over.
4. Hand out the informed consent.
5. Hand out the Reid Report.

SAY:
This is a questionnaire concerning integrity testing that you may complete. The questionnaire will be used strictly for research purposes and in no way will be used to make hiring decisions. The information obtained from the questionnaire will be completely anonymous. Do not put your name on it anywhere. Before completing the questionnaire, please read the informed consent document. If you choose to complete the questionnaire it is imperative that you be as honest as possible. Please complete the questionnaire and return to me when you are finished. Remember, your name is not on this and thus, there is not reason for you to not answer honestly.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR BOTH CONDITIONS:

SAY:
Thank you for your participation in the research study. Your data will remain completely anonymous and in no way can your data be used for hiring purposes. Once again, thank you for your participation and you are free to go.
Appendix D

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in the research study. The questionnaire that you completed is going to be examined to find out if it actually works as an integrity test. Your data will remain completely anonymous and in no way can your data be used for hiring purposes. If you want to know more about the study or want to know the outcome once the study is finished, please feel free to contact Dr. Brown or Caitlin Stewart (phone numbers can be found on the informed consent). However, we will not be able to give out individual information since the data are anonymous. Once again, thank you for your participation and you are free to go.